



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

But now, in the 19th, the Pope has deprived the Popish combatant of his weapon, and delivered him defenceless into the hands of Erasmus. The doctrine is no longer among pious opinions; it has been elevated to the rank of an article of faith. What could Melchior Canus say, or think, now? Would not his perplexity be greater still than St. Antoninus's? Would he not feel himself called on, now that the question is of an article of faith, to choose between the authorities and the usurpation? Would not the conclusions of his own reason, and the results of his own learning, in the work we have cited, constrain him to hold to the doctrine of the Fathers, and renounce the decree of the Pope?

Oh, that all our Roman Catholic brethren may feel the same constraint—that they may be guided to see the truth—to refuse the evil, and choose the good—to leave the novelties and falsehoods of Rome, and be on the side of antiquity, the Faith, and the Church!

#### HOW ARE WE TO DEAL WITH OUR FRIENDS WHO HAVE BECOME ROMAN CATHOLICS?

*In Conversations between two Clergymen of the Church of England, one of whom had seceded to Rome, and there submitted to a second Ordination.*

##### CONVERSATION I.

[NOTE.—The interlocutors are denoted by the letters R and A, which are the initials of *Roma* and *Anglia*.]

R. My dear A., I am glad to meet you and to find you alone. I was longing to see you, to take you to task for the cold and altered tone of all your recent letters, and especially for your peremptory refusal of my invitation to you to spend a few days with me in my new house.

A. I can most truly say, my old friend, that my affection and regard for you remain the same; but surely you can be at no loss to understand the reason of my altered tone, of which you complain, and I wonder you do not yourself see how impossible it is for me to accept your invitation.

R. Your coldness, then, I presume, has arisen from my having been reconciled to the Catholic Church. But I confess I did not expect such bigotry from my old college friend and intimate companion, whose mind, when I knew it best, was far above all narrow prejudice: it grieves me to think that you should now have become the victim of this illiberal spirit.

A. I believe, my dear R., that I am as little influenced by bigotry or an illiberal spirit as ever I was. But I am, as you know I always was, a firm believer in the doctrines of the Church of England. I believe those doctrines to be the true Catholic faith; and the Church whose communion you have joined, and to which you give the exclusive title of Catholic, is, I believe, in deep and fatal error, setting forth a modern corruption of Christianity, instead of the pure and primitive doctrine delivered to the saints by Christ and His apostles. Place yourself, then, I beg of you, in my position, and ask yourself, how I, believing this, ought to act towards you (deeply as I regard and love you), who have acted as you have towards the true Catholic faith.

R. Well, I really cannot see that I have done anything to occasion me the loss of your friendship and company. I have from conscientious motives, and from thorough conviction, I thank God for it, been reconciled to the Catholic Church—I beg your pardon, the Roman Catholic Church.

A. You need not beg my pardon; for, of course, you must think it to be the Catholic Church, and when you condescend to say *Roman Catholic*, you do so, I know, only in deference to what you consider my prejudices. But do you not see, that here at once is a complete obstacle to our continuing to be on the same terms that we once were, when we both thought alike, and both worshipped at the same altar. Every time you speak of the Catholic Church, meaning the Church of Rome, you beg the whole question that is at issue between us. You virtually call me and all who differ from you heretics. Can you imagine that any honest man, who truly believes his religion, could keep up an intimate connection, such as we once enjoyed, with a friend who is every moment thus, by implication, reminding him that he is regarded as a heretic? And I ask you to say with your old honesty, is the master much mended, when you reluctantly, as a sort of gracious concession, condescend to use the term "*Roman Catholic*?"

R. Well, but if that be all, I think we might make some compromise. I am sure, for my part, I am quite content to drop the name of Catholic Church, although, of course, I must continue to believe as I do; I am willing even to drop the name of Roman Catholic, if it gives you offence, and I will use only the title you have yourself employed, "the Church of Rome."

A. Thanks, my dear friend; but so long as you really believe me to be a heretic, and out of the pale of Christ's Church, the thing remains, use what words you may. So long as you believe this, I think you ought to say so. It is the fact that you do believe this, not your telling me so, that puts the real bar to the perfect cordiality of our friendship. But, then, I only mentioned this as a single point, which creates a difficulty at the outset. This is not all.

R. Well, what more. I am willing to remove all obstacles, so far as I am concerned. I confess I do not see why we may not agree to differ, and be as we were before.

A. That might be, if our differences did not involve the very faith itself, and even the hope of salvation. But I wonder you can talk thus, and it surprises me, I confess,

that you should be unable to place yourself in my position, and to understand that I could not with honesty and consistency have acted otherwise. Let me put a case of conscience to you. The Rev. Father O'Flanagan is an Irish Roman Catholic priest. He throws up his cure, goes over to Scotland, renounces his orders, and receives ordination from the Presbyterian Kirk. In due time he gets a parish, marries a parishioner, and when settled comfortably in his manse, writes to his old college friend, the Rev. Timothy O'Connell (who is still a Roman Catholic clergyman, in charge of a parish in Ireland), to ask him to spend a few days with him in his new house. What ought Father O'Connell to do? Would you honestly advise him to accept the invitation? And if not, why not?

R. I see your meaning; but the cases are widely different. The Church of Rome claims to be infallible. Your supposed convert, Father O'Flanagan, has cast off that infallible authority. His friend, therefore, whom you suppose to be a true Catholic, must regard him as one who has cast off the authority of God Himself, and, therefore, must look upon him in a very different light from that in which you have any right to regard me. I have not, even on your own principles, thrown off the authority of God, or set myself up against an infallible Church. I have simply exercised a right which you yourself, and all Protestants, concede to me. I have examined the tenets of your Church, which not even you yourself hold to be infallible; and though you may believe me wrong in the conclusion I have adopted, still you cannot, on your own principles, assert that I am guilty of setting myself up against the authority of God, and rejecting the divinely constituted rule and guide of faith. But Father O'Connell must regard his friend as having done this; in short, he must look upon his friend pretty much as you might have looked upon me if I had become an infidel or an atheist, and renounced the authority of the Scriptures, and everything that is divine and sacred.

A. The question, then, even as you state it, is only one of degree. Father O'Connell, you seem to admit, ought not, in the case supposed, to have accepted the invitation of his friend, and you also intimate that if you had become an infidel, instead of a Roman Catholic, I ought not to have accepted your invitation, because you would in that case have renounced what I believe to be an infallible rule of faith, as Father O'Connell's friend, in the imaginary case supposed, has renounced what he believes to be an infallible rule of faith. But as you have not renounced what I believe to be an infallible rule, therefore you think that I ought to treat your change as a thing indifferent, and live with you, and talk with you, exactly as I did when we thought alike. In other words, your argument assumes that I am doubtful of my faith; that I confess myself to have no certain foundation of faith; and that I ought not, therefore, to look upon you as having been guilty of any sin in renouncing that faith, in the manner and degree in which you have renounced it. I marvel, however, that you do not see, that there may be full and entire conviction of a truth in the mind, without any belief in the infallibility of the evidence or reasoning which produced that conviction; and that when fully convinced of the truth of a fact or doctrine, we are morally bound to act on the truth of that conviction, as much as if we were satisfied of its metaphysical infallibility. For my part, I am as thoroughly convinced that the true Catholic faith is held by the Church of England, and that the faith of Rome is corrupt, as if an angel from heaven had told me so. Nay, so fully satisfied am I of the truth of my creed, that if an angel were this moment to assure me that the doctrines of Trent were true and catholic, I believe it would be my duty, and I hope God would give me the grace, to answer him in the words of the Apostle—"Though we or an angel from heaven should preach any other gospel unto you than that which ye have received, let him be accursed." My mind is thoroughly satisfied, upon an evidence as full as I can expect or desire, that the doctrines I hold are in accordance with holy Scripture and with the teaching of the primitive Church, and that your peculiar doctrines are modern corruptions of Christianity. Thus, you see, your distinction is without a difference. I believe you to have denied the truth and to have adopted error. I believe this as much and as fully as if I had infallible evidence of it. So long as I do so believe, where is the difference of the two cases? The fact that I believe my religion to be true, is that which imposes upon me the obligation of acting accordingly;—not the reasons or motives which have led me to believe it true. Nay, if I had received my faith on the authority of an infallible teacher, I doubt if I should have had the same rational and satisfactory conviction of its truth that I now possess. At all events, the difference does not affect my moral duty. Whatever would have been Father O'Connell's duty, in the case supposed, is my duty in the actual case between you and me; and it is clear, from your own showing, that I cannot act otherwise, without distinctly admitting that I am less certain of the truth of my religion than I am of the truth of the Bible; or, in other words, that I am not so certain of the truth of my religion, as you are of the truth of yours. But this I can by no means admit; and I wonder you do not see, that if I did admit this I should be tacitly admitting the truth and reality of that infallible guidance to which the Church of Rome pretends.

R. And I, for my part, wonder greatly at your placing the evidence you suppose yourself to have for the truth of your religion, on the same footing with infal-

lible authority. You can have no evidence except that of your own reason and judgment, which you know to be liable to mistake and error; how is it possible that such evidence can equal that of an infallible guide, appointed by God Himself to be the judge of all controversies, and the vicar of Christ on earth?

A. But I have no evidence, at least no sufficient evidence, that any such guide exists. On the contrary, I am fully satisfied that the guide you have chosen, which you imagine to be infallible, is nothing of the sort; nor do I at all get rid of the necessity of trusting to my own reason and judgment, by adopting the guidance of your infallible tribunal. For you must first satisfy my reason and judgment that your Papal guide is infallible, before I will venture to trust it with the salvation of my soul. But the facts of history, the doctrines you avow, and the moral principles your divines advocate, furnish to my mind, fallible as I am, an evidence which compels my conscience to believe that the Church of Rome has erred, and is in error; whilst the arguments alleged in proof of her supposed infallibility are to me utterly insufficient, and many of them are so palpably manufactured to support a foregone conclusion (propped up, too, by forged authorities, and spurious Fathers,) that they tell in my mind the other way. In short, the evidence that the Church of Rome has erred is to me infinitely stronger than the arguments alleged to prove her infallible; and I am persuaded, that if our Lord had intended to delegate any such authority to the See of Rome as that which Pope Hildebrand and his successors claim, the evidence that He had done so would have been of a very different nature from that which Roman theologians have laid before the world. But I had no intention of discussing these points with you. I only wish to justify myself for the coldness and change of my manner towards you, my old and intimate friend, of which you complain. No one can regret the necessity for that change more than I do; and I hope I have convinced you that I cannot act otherwise, consistently with a full belief in the truth of my religion.

R. But you have not answered my question, how the evidence you suppose yourself to possess for your religion can ever equal that derived from an infallible guide?

A. I think I possess a higher evidence for my religion than if I had adopted it from the mere dictum of an infallible guide; because every step in the evidence of my religion, and every doctrine of my religion, commend themselves to my reason and judgment by an irresistible conviction; whereas the evidence of your religion resolves itself into the evidence of that one dogma of an infallible guide. You will say that my religion rests only on the evidence of my fallible reason and judgment; but I ask, how do you know your guide to be infallible, except on the evidence of your reason and judgment? You boasted just now that you had exercised that judgment in rejecting the religion of our Church and adopting that of Rome; and you said that I was bound to acknowledge your right to do so. I do admit your right. But, unless you claim a personal infallibility, you must also admit, that in coming to the conclusion you have adopted, you are as fallible as I acknowledge myself to be, in the conclusion I have adopted. A chain cannot be stronger than its weakest link. You have decided, by the exercise of your private judgment, that Rome is infallible: I have decided, and am convinced, that she is nothing of the sort. Here, therefore, we are both equally dependent on our private judgment. If my conviction of the truth of my religion rests on my fallible reason and judgment, your conviction of the infallibility of your guide rests upon your fallible reason and judgment. So that your doctrine of an infallible guide does not deliver you from the necessity of an ultimate dependence upon your private judgment. But let us return to the original question between us.

R. But my belief in the existence of an infallible guide does not deprive me of those evidences of my religion which are supplied by reason and historical facts. I am not compelled, as you are, to rest my all upon my fallible judgment. I am protected by an infallible guide from the errors to which my fallible reason is liable. Do I not, therefore, possess a great advantage over you, who can only rest upon your fallible private judgment?

A. But all this, you see, takes for granted that there is evidence for your doctrines sufficient for the conviction of all reasonable minds, apart from the decision of your infallible tribunal; and this is the very question at issue between us. If you could produce from Scripture and primitive antiquity any such evidence to prove your Tridentine doctrines to have been taught by the apostles, and received in all ages, as we can produce for the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, all disputes would be at an end between us. And if this be possible, why has it never been done?—for you know it never has been done; but instead of it, your books quote only comparatively modern decisions of councils, and decrees of popes. It is, therefore, my firm belief, that if any such evidence as we have for our religion could have been produced for yours (I mean, of course, for those points in which you differ from us), the pretence of an infallible tribunal would never have been set up, nor the necessity for it felt. The School Divines, with whom the doctrine of infallibility originated, were driven to that pretence in despair of finding any other mode of defending the corruptions of Christianity which they sought to impose upon the Church.

R. This is hard language, but I can bear it from you.

Do you, however, really mean to say that the existence of an infallible tribunal in the Church, supposing the evidence for it such as would satisfy you, would be no advantage?

A. I mean to say no such thing; for I believe we possess an infallible tribunal already—namely, the inspired Scriptures. I believe that I have received my religion from an infallible authority—namely, from our Saviour Christ and his Apostles; and it is precisely for this reason that I refuse to receive the dogmas that the Church of Rome now seeks to introduce into Christianity, because it is an essential part of my religion to keep the deposit and sacred tradition exactly as the Apostles delivered it to the Church, without addition or diminution; and I am satisfied that the peculiar dogmas of Rome formed no part of that religion which the really infallible authority, Christ and his Apostles, delivered to the saints, but, on the contrary, are in many important particulars directly contrary to that religion. We are now, however, in the very depths of the controversy, which I am quite willing to discuss with you in an amicable way, if you like. But pray let us first return to the original question. I hope I have satisfied you that my refusal to accept your invitation, and the altered tone of my letters, which you noticed, arose from a sense of duty, and not from any diminution of the regard and affection with which I must always regard you, dear R.

R. Well, I doubt not that it is so, A.—That is, I am sure you think it your duty to act as you do, since you tell me so; but I cannot say that you have satisfied me that it is your duty. Why should you feel your principles more compromised by keeping up your intimacy with me, than I feel my principles compromised by keeping up my intimacy with you, which I am most willing and anxious to do?

A. For this very obvious reason, dear R., that you have voluntarily and deliberately abandoned the Church, renouncing the holy orders you had received, and have submitted to be re-ordained in what I believe to be a schismatical body. Because you deny the validity of the sacraments of Christ, as they are administered in the Church of England; and in opposition to the plainest facts, and even to your own experience when you were in communion with our Church, you deny the existence of Divine grace amongst us, and affect to regard our Church as a mere creation of the civil power, without any recognition from Christ, or any real characteristics of a Christian Church. I cannot, therefore, be on the same terms of intimacy with you as I was before you committed this great and grievous sin (you must excuse my speaking my mind plainly). If I were to associate with you daily, as formerly, would not the world naturally conclude, that I did not believe it to be any sin to pronounce the Church of England a mere state engine, or a synagogue of Satan?—that I did not believe it to be any sin to deny the existence of sacramental grace in our Church?—that I did not believe it to be any sin to renounce the priesthood of the Church of England, and to submit to re-ordination in another communion? Would not you yourself justly and fairly draw the same conclusions? and would not your new brethren of the Church of Rome very naturally suppose, if they saw us associating as cordially and as intimately as ever, that I was more than half disposed to follow your example? And can I in common honesty act so as to give fair grounds for such a supposition, when in my inmost soul I believe you to have been guilty of a most grievous act of sacrilege in renouncing your ordination vows, and receiving re-ordination on pretence of the nullity of your former orders?—when I solemnly believe you to have committed an act of fearful schism in departing from the true faith, once for all delivered unto the saints, and adopting a system of doctrine and morals at utter variance with Holy Scripture, and with genuine apostolic tradition? Surely, then, it is impossible for me, in common honesty, to act in a way calculated to give rise to such an erroneous impression of my real sentiments; on the contrary, I think it my duty, as a Christian minister, to you, my Christian brother, to prove to you that I believe you to have committed a great sin; as it is also my duty to the Church, and to the Christian public, to show that I entirely disapprove of the step you have taken in renouncing your priesthood, and joining the communion of the Church of Rome; and how can I prove this more effectually than by letting everybody see that I am no longer as intimate with you as before. On the other hand, you run no risk of compromising yourself or your principles by associating with me; but, on the contrary, you will probably gain character by it amongst your Roman Catholic friends; for, if you can succeed in inducing me to continue on the same intimate terms with you as before, I shall be regarded, and I think very fairly, as a convert already half made, and you will be looked upon as being laudably and zealously engaged in completing a work so well begun.

R. I am afraid, then, if these be your sentiments, that I must give up my hopes, and be content with such poor remains of our former friendship as you may think fit to bestow upon me. But with respect to disbelieving the efficacy of the sacraments and the validity of orders in the English Church, let me say, that you yourselves supply me with ample grounds for doubt, when you denounce as you do the Catholic doctrine that the intention of the priest is necessary to the validity of the sacraments. For disbelieving that doctrine, your priests and bishops, of course, take no pains to have any intention in their administration of sacraments—and, in fact, in nine cases out of

ten they have none. How, then, can there be any valid sacrament in your Church? The minister who baptizes does not intend what the Church intends, and does not, perhaps, even believe that any grace is communicated in that sacrament. The minister that consecrates the Eucharist does not believe the real presence of Christ's Body and Blood, and consequently does not intend the sacrament to become Christ's Body and Blood. The bishop who ordains does not regard the priesthood as anything more than a mere civil office, and consequently does not intend to convey the gift of the Holy Ghost, or to imprint the sacerdotal character. Under these circumstances, how is it possible to believe in the validity of your orders or in the efficacy of your sacraments? I wonder how you can believe in them yourselves; and I am quite sure that if you were seriously to reflect on what I have now said, you would come to the same conclusion that I have done.

A. I have devoted, as you know, my whole life to the study of these subjects, and I know not how I can reflect more seriously upon them than I have already done. But as to what you have now said, the answer to it seems to me so obvious that your argument does not appear to require any reflection at all. If there be any such grossly ignorant priests and bishops in our Church who imagine the priesthood to be a merely civil office, and who are ignorant that there is an inward and spiritual grace in the sacraments, I am certain that they are, at all events, a very small minority amongst our clergy. Such persons are unworthy of their sacred calling; but, nevertheless, their unworthiness cannot hinder the effect of the sacraments, which depends not on the learning, knowledge, or holiness of him who administers them, but on the promises of Christ. This, as you know, is the doctrine of St. Augustine, and the contrary opinion was, if I mistake not, condemned in your Italian council at Trent; and therefore your argument, taken from the ignorance of some of our clergy, proves nothing against the validity of our orders and sacraments, even on your own principles. If the ignorance of a few of the clergy were to invalidate the orders and sacraments of an entire Church, the Church of Rome would, I think, find it no easy matter to justify her own sacraments; and you know it is the doctrine of all your Divines, that ignorance of the end does not invalidate the sacrament, if there be an intention of doing what the Church does. It is on this principle that you acknowledge the validity of a baptism by a heretic, or even by a Pagan.<sup>a</sup>

R. I do not speak of ignorance or erroneous opinions in general, but of a particular kind of ignorance, or rather of an opinion avowedly held and maintained very generally, if not universally, by your ministers, and defended by some of your learned men—that the intention of the priest or bishop is not necessary to the efficacy of the sacraments. The consequence of such an opinion must be, that your clergy will naturally be careless about the matter; and the majority of them, I have no doubt, minister without any intention at all. If so, therefore, how can you be certain that any of your sacraments are efficacious?

A. I confess I am surprised at your broaching the question of intention; for I think the doctrine of the ultramontane Divines on that subject one of the most vulnerable points in the modern Theology of Rome. But, in reply to what you say, I do not at all agree with you that a minister [I use the word *minister*, as technically signifying the person who ministers or administers a sacrament, whether bishop, priest, or layman] who holds no opinion at all as to the necessity of intention (for that is really the most that can be said against our clergy, rather than that they hold it not to be necessary), and who is therefore not thinking at all about his own intentions in the matter, is much more likely to intend to do what the Church does (to use the language of your Roman Divines) than to minister the sacraments, as you say, without any intention at all. I cannot, indeed, very easily conceive how a man could administer a sacrament without intending to do so, still less without any intention at all. Ask the most stupid and ignorant of our clergy, when he is robing himself in the vestry-room, what he is going to do. Will he not naturally answer, I am going to baptise a child, or to celebrate the Holy Communion? and does he not, therefore, naturally, and as a matter of course, intend to do so? In short, it appears to me that what you represent as a most likely case, and one that most commonly occurs with our clergy, is, in fact, very unlikely, and almost impossible. It could, I think, only occur with one who had been trained in the school doctrine, and who intentionally ministered without intention; or rather with the special and profane intention of so making void the sacrament.

R. Do you, then, say that a sacrament ministered by a priest in a state of somnambulism, or from any other cause, unconscious of what he was doing, would be a valid sacrament?

A. An extreme case of this kind is not very frequent, and when it occurs it is easy to see that the man is in a state unfit for so solemn a duty. But I cannot think that

even were the minister, from bodily infirmity, unconscious, provided all things requisite are duly done, that even such administration of the sacraments would be null. If the atheism, impiety, and utter unworthiness of the minister hinder not the effect of the sacrament, why should somnambulism, or unconsciousness, from whatever cause? But you do not, I suppose, pretend that the English bishops or clergy are usually in a state of somnambulism, or unconscious of what they are doing, when they minister the sacraments?

R. No; but I say they generally do not believe themselves under any obligation of intending to do what the Church does; and, therefore, are incapable of administering a valid sacrament.

A. But a minister, however ignorant, if he uses the form and words and matter, which the Church, in conformity with Christ's ordinance, prescribes, cannot but express the intention of the Church in whose name he ministers; nor can his ignorance, more than any other sin or unworthiness, hinder the effects of the sacrament.

R. But still he can intend only the external act; in other words, he aims only at performing the service according to your ritual, without intending or thinking of—without, perhaps, knowing or believing in the end, (that is to say, the grace conferred by the sacrament), and, therefore, without even the general intention of the end, implied in the desire of doing whatever the Church does.

A. We are not now speaking of laymen or Pagans, who, according to your Roman Divines, may validly confer baptism, if only they intend to do what Christians do, without knowing what that is. We are speaking of clergymen who may be expected to know something more; and few of our clergy, I think, are so stupid as to perform the outward ceremony without knowing that it is only a means to an end—the outward and visible sign of an inward spiritual grace. But even if there should be such a clergyman, he is at least a voluntary agent; he is not worse than a Pagan; he wills, at least, no matter from what motive, to perform the liturgical ceremony, and thereby expresses the intention of the Church, no matter what may be the amount of his own ignorance or errors on the subject. And I believe with St. Augustine, that God supplies all defects of sin and ignorance, whether voluntary or involuntary, in the minister; or otherwise, the promises and sacraments of Christ, and the very salvation of the faithful, would be dependant upon man.

R. But if this were all, the definitions of the councils that intention is requisite would be superfluous; for in your sense of the word intention, no person could perform a sacramental ceremony, or any act whatsoever, if conscious, and a voluntary agent, without intending to do that act; so that to make a formal synodical decree declaring such intention necessary would be childish. As well might the councils decree that no man should preach without opening his mouth.

A. I perfectly agree with you. I believe it was quite unnecessary to make any decree on the subject; and, therefore, so long as the Roman Church held the old Catholic doctrine, which we still hold, and which I have stated to you, no decree was made on the subject. And I fully admit that the two modern synods, which you consider councils—that of Florence and that of Trent—did mean something more. And by so doing, they have departed from the ancient doctrine of the Church on this subject. Even St. Thomas Aquinas<sup>b</sup> has very distinctly stated our doctrine, and I am quite contented to accept his statement of it. He says that the minister who uses the words prescribed by the Church, without the open declaration of anything to the contrary, thereby expresses the intention of the Church, and confers a valid sacrament, no matter what may be his private thoughts or intentions. But I know that other school Divines, and particularly the modern ultramontane theologians, have gone beyond this, and have interpreted “the intention of doing what the Church does” (which are the cautious words of the Florentine and Tridentine Doctors), as necessarily implying an intention of the end proposed by the Church.<sup>c</sup>

R. And with good reason. To me it seems self-evident that such intention is necessary. The minister who, in baptizing, intends only the outward immersion or affusion, without intending to perform any religious or sacred act, cannot be said to intend to do what the Church does, and, in fact, can intend nothing more than a mere washing or sprinkling of the body with water.

A. I can scarcely, however, imagine a clergyman celebrating Baptism, or the Holy Communion, using all the prayers and words of our offices, and yet not intending to perform any religious or sacred act. If, therefore, this intention of performing a sacred act, as the Church performs it, be sufficient (as you say it is), even in ignorance of the full sacramental meaning of the act, if this, I say, be sufficient, it seems very hard to imagine how any clergyman of our Church, using our Liturgy, can fail to intend to do what the Church does, unless he be utterly profane and impious. And if he be, his impiety and wickedness, however gross, cannot hinder the effect of the sacraments. I see, however, that you are of the ultramontane school in this question. But you will recollect that you are now ex-

<sup>a</sup> It may suffice to quote on this point the Jesuit Perrone, Professor of Divinity in Rome:—“Diligenter animadvertendum est, non semper opus esse ut conferens baptismum sciat illud esse a Christo institutum, aut intendat facere quod Christus instituit; sed satis est, ut intendat facere quod novit in ecclesia, seu in cœtu Christianorum fieri; alioquin si paganus ignoraret Christi institutionem, invalide conferret baptismum, dum intendit ponere id quod in ecclesia novit fieri.”—Tract. de Sacram. in genere, c. iii., prop. 3, not.

<sup>b</sup> Aquin. Summa. lib. 3, qu. 64, 5.

<sup>c</sup> Bellarmine De Sacram. in gener. l. 1, c. 27.

pressing opinions in which all Divines of the Roman Church do not agree with you; and therefore, if your objection to the validity of the sacraments in the Church of England rests upon our rejecting your modern doctrine of intention, or upon our believing an external intention sufficient, and not requiring an intention of the end, the same objection will apply to the sacraments as ministered by those of the Roman communion who think with us. And so we are no worse off than many in France, Belgium, and Germany, who follow the doctrine of Ambrose Catharinus in this point.

R. I can tell you, however, that such an opinion is now everywhere discountenanced, and that its advocates are very few.

A. I think that is very likely, although until lately they were numerous enough; but however few they may now be, the same objection applies to their ministrations of the sacraments which you have directed against us. I was quite aware, however, that the doctrine now prevailing in the Roman Church is that which you maintain, that intention of the external rite alone is not sufficient; and this was the reason why I said that I considered the modern Roman doctrine about intention one of the most vulnerable points in your theology.

(To be continued.)

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

In consequence of several persons having returned copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, which had been already paid for by friends, under the apprehension that they might be called on hereafter in person to pay for them, we beg to call their attention to the following announcement—viz., that any one receiving any number of this journal which has not been ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

## The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MARCH 15, 1856.

WE made an offer in our last number to the Most Rev. Doctor Cullen to place at his disposal four columns of our pages in every number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN to the end of the year, in which any Roman Catholic priest whom he might name should be at liberty to print whatever he thought fit or necessary, to expose what Dr. Cullen was pleased to denominate our "vain and frivolous attacks upon the Church of Rome;" but we regret to say, that though we have kept our columns open to the latest possible moment for the purpose, no communication whatever has been made to us upon the subject.

If we had been so unreasonable as to require that Dr. Cullen should, personally, have taken on himself the task, he might, of course, not unreasonably have pleaded the weight and magnitude of his episcopal duties as an excuse for declining the offer; but when we expressly stated that any Roman Catholic priest, whom he might name to perform the duty, should have his communications treated with the greatest courtesy, and that we would print, free of all expense to Dr. Cullen, whatever that reverend gentleman might be pleased to send us in answer to our attacks, we did hope that some of the many able men in the ranks of the Irish priesthood might, at the instance of their most rev. superior, have been able to spare time enough to expose the want of real argument in our paper, and thus neutralize its influence by making our pages recoil upon ourselves. We still hope that Dr. Cullen's only difficulty lies in the wise selection of the gentleman to be deputed. Though, after all, we can scarcely think it greatly signifies who the individual may be, when, of course, he would always have at hand the ready assistance of so many of his learned colleagues, and the important supervision, when deemed necessary, of the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen himself.

If Dr. Cullen's charge against us be founded

in truth, the task could not be one of serious difficulty. If it be not founded in truth—and Dr. Cullen feels that it is not so—the matter, of course, assumes a character of greater delicacy and difficulty; and we cannot wonder that he should think it the safest course to refrain from discussion, and rest satisfied with abuse.

It is now nearly four years since we published the following passage in treating of the boasted unanimous consent of the Fathers:—

"But it will be said that the Church of Rome appeals only to the 'unanimous consent' of the Fathers—that is, that she relies upon them only when they all agree, and disregards them when they differ. Now, we are not going to speak with disrespect of the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Far from it; we know that all the Fathers, and the whole Church from the beginning, have all consented unanimously in all the articles of faith contained in the ancient Catholic creeds—in the Apostles' Creed, in the Nicene Creed, and in the Athanasian Creed. We join in that same consent; and we glory and rejoice in doing so, and in this consent we hope to live and die; and while we do this, we trust that we hold the Catholic faith. But any unanimous consent among the Fathers, in any article of faith not contained in these creeds, we have never found. It is nothing new or strange to say this. It was felt and confessed by the Fathers themselves: 'which ancient consent of Holy Fathers is not so carefully and diligently to be both sought for and followed, in every small question of the Divine law, but only, or at least especially, in the Rule of Faith' (i.e., the Catholic Creed).—St. Vincent Com., ch. 28. It is senseless to dispute about the authority which should belong to any such consent until we know whether there be any such consent. This ought to be brought to the test. WE HERE SOLEMNLY CALL UPON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS OF IRELAND, and upon the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, upon all and each of them, TO BRING FORWARD ANY OTHER ARTICLE OF FAITH, IN WHICH THEY CAN SHOW ANY SUCH UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF THE FATHERS. Let them take any one of the twelve articles which Pope Pius the Fourth added to the creed of the Roman Church fifteen hundred and sixty-four years after Christ; let them tell us any one of those twelve new articles of which they will undertake to show that it is supported as an article of faith by the unanimous consent of the Fathers. If they will undertake to answer this challenge, we undertake that the subject shall be fairly and candidly considered in our pages. If such an unanimous consent can be shown for any one of those twelve new articles of faith, it will be a fair question then to consider what degree of authority should be allowed to such a consent. But if no Roman Catholic priest or bishop will venture to answer this challenge, or to point out any one of those articles for which they can undertake to produce such a 'unanimous consent of the Fathers,' we may fairly conclude that the thing is impossible; that no consent of the Fathers can be found in any articles of faith, except those contained in the ancient Catholic creeds.

"Why should not the Roman Catholic bishops and priests do this that we propose? They boast of having converted many Protestants of learning, and candour, and sincerity. If it was by fair argument, and discussion, and proof that they have converted them, why should they not hope to convert the conductors of this journal to all the same opinions, by the same means? But there is a still more urgent reason for the Roman Catholic priests and bishops doing what we now call upon them to do. Discussion is now going on among the Roman Catholic laity, and their priests and bishops cannot safely disregard it. We warn them that what we now write will be read by THOUSANDS of Irish Roman Catholics. If no answer to our challenge be given, those thousands of Roman Catholics will easily understand that no answer can be given. Will the bishops and priests allow so many thousands to be led astray, if it be in their power to set them right? How can they justify such negligence before God or man?"

We appeal to our readers whether such a challenge ought not to have been responded to? and whether we did not take a sufficiently broad stand, and assign sufficient motives to induce some one at least of the twenty-eight Roman Catholic Bishops and above two thousand Roman Catholic priests in Ireland to undertake the task of proving that Pope Pius IV.'s new creed was supported by the "unanimous consent of the Fathers?"

Yet not one has been found to undertake the task in or out of our pages; and the only result of our challenge appears to have been, that the controversial sermons usually preached in our metropolis during Lent have of late been discontinued.

Was Dr. Cullen afraid that we should go into his chapels to hear those sermons, and afterwards answer their arguments, though they would not answer ours? Perhaps so; and if so, why

should he be afraid of it if he has truth on his side?

Truth, alas! seems to enter but little into the consideration of many who talk loudly of unity and faith.

"Believe what I believe, and don't trouble yourself whether it be true or false," seems to be the language of the Church of Rome.

With us the first and greatest question with respect to anything in religion is, is it true? If it be true, it is right; if it be not true, it is wrong.

The great philosopher, John Locke, says, in his Essay on the human understanding:—

"There is nobody in the commonwealth of learning who does not profess himself to be a lover of truth; and there is not a rational creature that would not take it amiss to be otherwise thought of. And yet, for all this, one may truly say, that there are very few lovers of truth for truth-sake, even among those who do persuade themselves they are so."

He then goes on to say:—

"Whatsoever credit or authority we give to any proposition more than it receives from the principles and proofs it supports itself upon, is owing to our inclinations that way, and is so far a derogation from the love of truth as such; which, as it can receive no evidence from our passions or interests, so it should receive no tincture from them. There is one unerring mark whereby any man may know whether he be in earnest a lover of truth or not, viz.—the not entertaining any proposition with greater assurance than the proofs it is built on will warrant. Whoever goes beyond this measure of assent, it is plain, receives not truth in the love of it—loves not truth for truth-sake, but for some other by-end. It is as impossible, that the love of truth should carry my assent above the evidence there is to me that it is true, as that the love of truth should make me assent to any proposition for the sake of the evidence which it has not, that it is true; which would be, in effect, to love it as a truth, because it is possible or probable that it may not be true. In any truth that gets not possession of our minds by the inevitable light of self-evidence, or by the force of demonstration, the arguments that gain its assent are the vouchers and gage of its probability to us: we can receive it for no other than such as they deliver it to our understandings.

"The assuming an authority of dictating to others is a constant concomitant of an undue bias and corruption of our judgments. And how can it be otherwise but that he should be ready to impose on another's belief, who has already imposed on his own? Who can reasonably expect arguments and conviction from him, in dealing with others, whose understanding is not accustomed to them in his dealing with himself? who does violence to his own faculties, tyrannises over his own mind, and usurps the prerogative that belongs to truth alone—which is, to command assent by only its own authority, i.e., by and in proportion to that evidence which it carries with it."

It is upon the former of these great principles, the love of truth, that we strive to act; and it remains to be seen whether Dr. Cullen is acting on it also, or whether he adopts the other practice alluded to as his guide.

We shall still hold four columns of our paper at Dr. Cullen's disposal, and hope our Roman Catholic readers will not be again disappointed, in their hopes to see what they believe to be true, ably defended, and the fallacy of our arguments exposed, under the sanction of the Pope's Legate in Ireland, either in or out of our pages.

In consequence of several applications made to us from time to time for permission to reprint articles from our pages, we hereby beg to announce to all booksellers, newspaper proprietors, and others, that as our only object is the wide diffusion of what we earnestly believe to be religious truth (without any reference to pecuniary recompense or literary reputation), any person whatever is henceforward at liberty to republish, with or without acknowledgment, any article which has already appeared, or may hereafter appear, in our pages. We only request that such reprints may be made with care and accuracy, and that the proprietor or editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN may be furnished at the same time with a copy, and a statement where additional copies of the reprinted article, or articles, may be procured, and at what price—which we shall be happy (if desired) to advertise in our paper for the benefit of benevolent persons who may wish to procure or distribute them.